



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,274	11/03/2000	Susanne Arney	ARNEY 8-51-1	6293

7590

02/12/2003

Charles W Gaines  
Hitt Gaines & Boisbrun PC  
PO Box 832570  
Richardson, TX 75083

EXAMINER

SODERQUIST, ARLEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/706,274

Applicant(s)  
Arney et al.

Examiner  
Arlen Soderquist

Art Unit  
1743



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 2, 2002
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-11, 13-20, 22-26, 28-35, 37-41, and 43-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 12, 21, 27, 36, and 42 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 17-43 have been renumbered 19-45.

The application as filed has two claims numbered 17 and two claims numbered 18. Applicant's deposit account has been charged for the two extra claims.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-4, 7, 14, 16-19, 22 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Enlow (newly cited and applied). In the paper Enlow discusses development of test vehicles for evaluating plastic-encapsulant reliability and improving thermal conductivity of encapsulant materials. Plastic-encapsulated microcircuits (PEMs) are proposed for use in military systems. PEMs reduce cost and eliminate long-lead items such as packages and lids. Encapsulant materials must be evaluated for compatibility with devices and fine-wire bonds, and electrical stability on deposited elements and integrated-circuit devices. Reliability evaluations in screen tests and various temperature/humidity/bias environments are also essential prior to use in advanced packaging. Encapsulant reliability evaluation requires a test vehicle (MCM-C and MCM-L) to identify these key performance characteristics. Commercial off-the-shelf parts that

may be sensitive to encapsulant screening are transistor devices or PROM parts that can be tested for leakage currents, or programmed and verified. No complete multichip test vehicle, however, is available for use. An encapsulant test vehicle with three unpassivated resistor networks used in previous work was modified by substituting a Sandia ATC04 chip and a silver-comb-pattern array with varying feature sizes (2-, 5-, 17- and 25- $\mu$ m lines and spaces) and using only a single nichrome-resistor network (pages 315-316). Finally, a deposited comb pattern was added. The remaining single unpassivated resistor and a silver-comb pattern offer both a go/no-go and quantitative test for screening encapsulants. Use of the Sandia chip facilitates stress measurements on the die as well as thermal dissipation evaluation with resistance heaters on the chip. An industry-standard encapsulant, Hysol FP 4450, was modified by substitution of silica-coated aluminum nitride or boron nitride and spherical alumina fillers for the standard silica fillers. Other components in the material are a blend of epoxy resins and an aromatic anhydride hardener. Exact filler selection and loading were optimized, balancing dispensability, wear, and flow characteristics. Control materials (Hysol FP 4450) and improved, thermally conductive versions were exposed to short-term screen tests, long-term temperature cycling, humidity cycling, and elevated temperature storage testing. The set of comb electrodes of varying sizes and spacings as shown in figure 3b meets the limitations of the rejected claims in that the comb patterns with narrower spacing inherently oxidize at a rate greater than the electrical component (combs with the larger spacing). This inherent property results in the go/no-go and quantitative results taught on page 316.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 5, 8-11, 13, 15, 20, 23-26, 28, 30-35, 37-41 and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shea, as applied to claims 1-4, 7, 14, 16-19, 22 and 29 above, and further in view of Sweet (newly cited and applied and Burack, Mancke or Wada (1989). The Enlow paper does not teach an integrated circuit including the sensing device or the sensing device in the form of a serpentine trace made from the specifically claimed metals.

In the paper Sweet discusses high reliability plastic packaging for microelectronics. This Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) project conducted in fiscal years 1996 and 1997 under case 3526.030 was devoted to the development of test structures and associated measurement methodology for assessing the reliability of plastic encapsulated microelectronic devices. The end goal was the conceptual specification of one or more Assembly Test Chips (ATCs) which could be used evaluating plastic encapsulation technologies. In this work the authors demonstrated suitable circuits for measuring Au-Al wirebond and Al metal corrosion failure rates during accelerated temperature and humidity testing. Also the test circuits on the authors' ATC02.5 chip were very sensitive to extrinsic or processing induced failure rates. A number of accelerated aging experiments were conducted with unpassivated triple track aluminum structures on the ATC02.6 chip to demonstrate that these would be extremely sensitive to environmental conditions. The authors found an unexpected result, the unpassivated tracks were very sensitive to particulate contamination which caused conductor damage and resultant high voltage breakdown. A number of modifications to existing circuitry were suggested as a result of the unpassivated device experiments. Also the piezoresistive stress sensing circuitry which the authors had designed for the ATC04 test chip was suitable for determining the change in the state of mechanical stress at the die when both initial and final measurements were made near room temperature. However, the authors' attempt to measure thermal stress between room temperature and a typical polymer glass transition temperature failed because of excessive die

resistor-substrate breakage currents at the high temperature end. Suitable circuitry changes were developed which should eliminate this problem. One temperature and humidity experiment was conducted with Sandia developed static random access memory (SRAM) parts to examine non-corrosion CMOS failures. This experiment did not achieve the desired objective because of processing problems but the authors did demonstrate that the authors could easily detect and measure a new type of corrosion failure mode, this time at the model to Si contacts on the die surface. As a result of this two year effort, the authors have new designs for a number of test circuits which could be used on an advanced ATC for reliability assessment in Defense Programs electronics development projects. In the final paragraph of page 27 Sweet teaches that the next logical step is to demonstrate on model weapons electronics system that a multifunction ATC could detect the presence of potentially damaging environments before actual integrated circuits started to fail.

In the paper Burack discusses enhanced moisture protection of electronic devices by ultrathin polyimide films. Thin films of polyimide which exhibit enhanced resistance to moisture were fabricated using the Langmuir-Blodgett (LB) technique. The adhesion strength of both LB and spin-coated films of several different polyimides, deposited on fused silica, was measured by subjecting these films to steam or water, followed by a tape test, and monitoring changes in the UV spectra of the films, showing that the LB films of polyimide adhere better to fused silica than spin-coated films. In addition, water vapor transmission rate measurements through Kapton sheet coated by a monolayer of any of the polyimides show that a monolayer forms a moisture barrier, decreasing the water vapor transmission through the Kapton. Based on these results, the electrical performance of polyimide films was tested at 85°, 85% humidity, by measuring leakage current between conducting paths (figure 6) under 180-V bias, on samples which were coated with various combinations of LB and spin-coated polyimide films. Composite films of polyimide consisting of a LB monolayer, either underneath or on top of a thick, spin-coated film, exhibited superior electrical performance to either a spin-coated or LB film by itself. This may be explained by the improved adhesion and/or decreased water permeability of polyimide LB films.

In the paper Mancke discusses a moisture protection screening test for hybrid circuit encapsulants. An empirical comparative screening test for polymeric encapsulants was described with respect to figures 1-4 and used to indicate how well different materials prevent unwanted leakage currents between closely spaced biased metal lines in hybrid integrated circuits. The screening test circuit, test procedure, and test conditions are described. This test and measurement equipment were developed earlier by N. L. Sbar and R. P. Kozakiewicz (1977-9). Data for two silicone coatings and one epoxy coating were compared with data for DC 3-6550 RTV. Results are also shown for layers of two different polymer coatings. The coatings of the same general polymer type varied considerably in performance in this screening test.

The Wada paper discusses the influence of passivation layer on aluminum corrosion on simulated microelectronics circuit pattern. The corrosion of thin Al is one of the important failure mechanisms in integrated circuits. Al corrosion and electrolytic leakage current were studied by temperature-humidity-bias tests. Two different passivation layers were investigated: a double layer of nondoped silicate glass (NSG) on phosphosilicate glass (PSG), and single layer of plasma-deposited SiN. Samples were prepared with 3 different combinations of width/spacing: 2/2  $\mu\text{m}$  (width/spacing), 4/4 and 12/6  $\mu\text{m}$ , 2/2 and 4/4  $\mu\text{m}$  patterns with a passivation layer on the stripes and a 12/6  $\mu\text{m}$  pattern in which a part of the passivation layer is etched to expose the Al stripe. Investigation of these patterns via temperature-humidity-bias tests leads to the following conclusions. With SiN passivation, cathodic Al corrosion did not occur on 2/2 and 4/4  $\mu\text{m}$  patterns. On the other hand, with PSG + NSG passivation, cathodic corrosion occurred on 3 patterns. In 12/6  $\mu\text{m}$  patterns with SiN passivation, the leakage current increased earlier than did that of 2/2 and 4/4  $\mu\text{m}$  SiN passivated patterns. Thus, leakage current is conducted through the interface between the passivation layer and the plastic resin. In a special Al pattern in which a part of SiN passivation layer is etched to expose the stripe, local anodic corrosion was dominant. This anodic corrosion can be explained by the F in CF<sub>4</sub>/O<sub>2</sub> plasma used for SiN etching.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the serpentine sensors of Sweet, Burack, Mancke or Wada into the Enlow multifunction test chip for their recognized equivalent information regarding failure of

conductors for a wide range of metals used in electronic devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the multifunction testing structure into actual integrated circuit packages as taught by Sweet because of their ability to detect environments and other effects that would cause failures of the integrated circuit before the integrated circuit actually fails.

6. Claims 6, 12, 21, 27, 36, and 42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The art does not teach or fairly suggest the respective structures.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Enlow reference clearly has a structure that is designed to have at least one components oxidize (create a short) before other electrical components in the electronic circuit.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The additional art related to detecting failures in electrical devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arlen Soderquist whose telephone number is (703) 308-3989. The examiner's schedule is variable between the hours of about 5:30 AM to about 5:00 PM on Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays.

For communication by fax to the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned, (703) 305-7719 may be used for official, unofficial or draft papers. When using this number a call to alert the examiner would be appreciated. Numbers for faxing official papers are 703-872-9310 (before finals), 703-872-9311 (after-final), 703-305-7718, 703-305-5408 and 703-305-5433. The above fax numbers will generally allow the papers to be forwarded to the examiner in a timely manner.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



February 7, 2003

ARLEN SODERQUIST  
PRIMARY EXAMINER